

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5-18, as amended, remain herein. Claims 19 and 20 have been added.

1. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-12 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ichiro Japanese Patent Application Publication 2002-213910 (JP '910) in view of Gassman et al. U.S. Patent 6,909,281.

Regarding claim 1, applicants' invention comprises a ferromagnetic body that encircles a magnet and is incorporated in and rotatable with a first detecting rotator and a second detecting rotator. *See* Amended Claim 1, Figs. 1-4. Ichiro JP '910 does not describe such a ferromagnetic body.

Likewise, Gassman does not describe such a ferromagnetic body. Gassman describes a ferromagnetic material placed adjacent to or completely surrounding each discrete magnet to selectively reduce its magnetic field and therefore control its effect on subsequent magnets. *See* Gassman col. 12, lines. 1-4. Gassman does not describe a ferromagnetic body that encircles a magnet and is incorporated in and rotatable with a first detecting rotator or a second detecting rotator, as recited in applicants' claim 1. Further, Gassman describes a series of magnets which move in a straight line with respect to a detector. *See* Gassman Fig. 3A, col. 5, line 50- col. 6 line 19.

There is no disclosure, suggestion or instruction in either Ichiro or Gassman which would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine any portion of their subject matter effectively to anticipate or render obvious applicants' claim 1 invention.

Since claim 1 is not obvious over Ichiro in view of Gassman, and claims 2, 5 and 8-9 depend on claim 1, they, too, are not obvious over those references.

Regarding claim 10, Ichiro does not disclose a magnetic detector with a first ferromagnetic body encircling and fixed with respect to one of the first magnetic detector and the second magnetic detector, as recited in applicants' amended claim 10.

Nor does Gassman describe such a ferromagnetic body. Gassman describes a ferromagnetic material placed adjacent to or completely surrounding each discrete magnet to selectively reduce its magnetic field and therefore control its effect on subsequent magnets. It is not fixed with respect to a magnetic detector. *See* Gassman col. 12, lines. 1-4. Further, Gassman describes a series of magnets which move in a straight line with respect to a detector. *See* Gassman Fig. 3A, col. 5, line 50- col. 6 line 19.

Neither Ichiro nor Gassman contains any disclosure, suggestion, or instruction which would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine any portion of their subject matter effectively to anticipate or render obvious a magnetic detector with a first ferromagnetic body encircling and fixed with respect to one of the first magnetic detector and the second magnetic detector, as recited in applicants' claim 10. Nor do they contain any disclosure, suggestion, or instruction which would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine a rotational magnet array with a linear magnet array.

Since claim 10 is not obvious over Ichiro in view of Gassman, and claims 11-12 and 15-18 depend on claim 10, these claims, too, are not obvious over Ichiro in view of Gassman.

For all these reasons, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

2. Claims 6, 13, 7 and 14 were rejected under §103(a) over Ichiro and Gassman, further in view of Bergstedt U.S. Patent 5,602,472.

As admitted in the Office Action, "Ichiro and Gassman do not explicitly disclose that the first ferromagnetic body comprises a ring-shaped iron plate or pieces arranged in the form of a ring (as in claims 7 and 14)." Furthermore, Bergstedt does not disclose, teach or suggest a ferromagnetic body that encircles a magnet and is incorporated in and rotatable with a first detecting rotator and a second detecting rotator, or a ferromagnetic body encircling and fixed with respect to one of a first magnetic detector and a second magnetic detector, as recited in each of applicants' claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Thus, for the reasons discussed herein, there is no disclosure or teaching of Ichiro in Bergstedt, of what is lacking in Ichiro and/or Gassman. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Ichiro, Gassman, or Bergstedt which would have suggested combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of all claims 6, 13, 7, and 14, are respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, all claims 1, 2 and 5-20 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge or credit any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. Should the

Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, he is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
Adam C. Ellsworth
Reg. No. 55,152

Date: October 23, 2006

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-6420